Supplement to:
Chapter 12, AID Handbook 3,
Project Assistance

AID EVALUATION HANDBOOK

AID PROGRAM DESIGN AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY REPORT NO. 7

U.S. Agency for International Development

April 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

*Appendix D and revisions to the Bibliography added November, 1988.

GLOSSARY

CDIE	Center for Development Information and Evaluation
CDSS	Country Development Strategy Statement
CPSS	Central Program Strategy Statement
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
MIS	Management Information System
OE	Operating Expenses
PMD	Program Assistance Approval Document
PACD	Project Assistance Completion Date
PACR	Project Assistance Completion Report
PD&S	Program Development and Support
PID	Project Identification Document
PIO/T	Project Implementation Order/Technical Services
PPC	Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination

1. AID POLICY CONCERNING THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

AID considers adequate information about the use and results of development assistance to be an integral and indis- pensable element of sound management by the Agency and its counterpart borrowers and grantees. Adequate information is required for (1) monitoring the progress and performance of development activities during their implementation, (2) evaluating the benefits and effects of these activities, and (3) documenting the experience gained and lessons learned from these activities for use in the design of future development projects and programs.

AID requires this information for activities supported by all modes of development assistance for which AID has management responsibility--including project assistance, "non-project" assistance, PL 480, and other forms of loans and grants.[1] Moreover, AID considers adequate information about the performance, benefits, and effects of development assistance to include information not only at the level of specific project or program activities, but also at the level of several projects, sector programs, and overall portfolios of Missions, Offices, and Bureaus that seek to promote broader country or program objectives.[2]

The primary purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to assist the managers of development activities make well-informed decisions. Therefore, AID requires that the level of effort and resources directed to monitoring and evaluation be commensurate with management's need for information.

Monitoring and evaluation must meet the information requirements of managers at different organizational levels within the Agency and, correspondingly, the information requirements of their counterparts. Although the types of information needed by managers at different levels are often

---

[1]For additional guidance about monitoring and evaluation for nonproject types of assistance see Evaluation Guidelines for Nonproject Assistance: Commodity Import Programs (CIPs) and CIP-Like Activities, AID Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report No. 4, Washington, D.C.: AID, August 1985; and Information Planning for Policy Reform Programs, AID Evaluation Occasional Paper No. 13., Washington, D.C.: AID, August 1986.

[2]In general, this Handbook uses the term "project" to refer to a specific project, "nonproject," or other assistance program activity that has been designed to promote discrete objectives. The term "program" is used to refer to more comprehensive efforts by AID to promote broader or longer term objectives such as those that are encompassed by a sector or policy program, or a country, regional, or central Bureau program strategy.

similar or complementary, each organizational level also has its own specific information requirements. Therefore, it is AID's policy to support a variety of monitoring and evaluation activities to obtain the range of information needed by Agency and counterpart managers.

To meet its internal management information needs, AID makes a general distinction between monitoring and evaluation in terms of the type and timing of information that managers at different levels require to carry out their responsibilities most effectively. Monitoring by AID officers is a continuous management activity that requires information about (1) the use of assistance resources according to plans and regulations and (2) the interim results and effects of resources in light of initial or revised objectives (ongoing evaluation). Particularly at the project level, managers use this information to adjust or redesign activities to keep them on track toward their objectives, to raise issues for resolution by more senior managers, or to call for a more comprehensive evaluation.

AID defines evaluation as a management activity that is undertaken selectively to inform managers about key issues before major decisions are made regarding existing AID-funded activities or future program development, that is, the issues of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Depending on the scope of the decision, evaluation takes place at the level of specific projects or broader programs. Because the information needed for monitoring is also essential for evaluation, AID regards these two management activities as being closely related.[3]

AID managers are required to define and communicate their needs for evaluative information through a systematic planning process so that priority needs for information can be addressed before forseeable decision or action points are reached. Therefore, AID requires the developement of Annual Evaluation Plans by Missions, Offices, and Bureaus. Regional and central Bureau evaluation plans, which incorporate the plans of their respective Missions and Offices, are submitted to and reviewed by the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination.

Evaluation should be a cooperative activity that addresses the information requirements of the host country or recipient organization as well as AID Hence, evaluation is a joint responsibility of AID and its counterparts, as stated in loan or grant agreements. The participation of counterpart personnel in evaluation should be encouraged to the fullest extent that capabilities and interests allow. Moreover, both monitoring and evaluation constitute an appropriate management technology for

---

[3]For a more detailed discussion of monitoring and evaluation, see A Guide to Evaluation Practice in AID, AID Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report No. 10.

aid recipient countries. It is an Agency objective, therefore, to establish or strengthen the capabilities of host country personnel for monitoring and evaluation so that they play a central role in assessing their AID-assisted development projects and programs.

At the project level, monitoring and ongoing evaluation should provide information about the use of project resources and should track progress toward the development objectives of the project, as defined by the output, purpose, and goal statements of the project’s Logical Framework. On the basis of such information, managers should be better able to determine what changes are needed to improve project performance. Interim and final project evaluations should produce additional information about progress toward sector-level objectives, broader programming issues, and lessons learned.

At the program level, AID managers are instructed to develop comparable monitoring and evaluation systems to generate and use information drawing on data from specific projects, multiproject evaluations, special studies, and other relevant sources to periodically assess progress toward achievement of the overall development objectives of AID’s assistance. These assessments should provide useful information for program planning and sector strategy development. Such program-level assessments should assist Mission Directors and their staff to meet their responsibilities for accountability in managing development assistance.

The Agency will also conduct comparative studies to evaluate the impact of a category of projects or programs or to examine broad, cross-cutting issues important to senior management for formulating Agency policy, procedures, and special development programs.

In addition to these uses, the results of AID-sponsored evaluations should contribute to improving future development activities. It is the Agency’s policy, therefore, that pertinent evaluation findings be used to plan new or follow-on projects and programs.

To implement the Agency’s monitoring and evaluation policy, AID/Washington Bureaus and Offices and USAID field Missions are required to provide sufficient funds and staff to ensure that the types and amounts of information needed are available. Because of the range of management’s information requirements and the diversity of development problems confronting aid recipient countries, uniform requirements concerning the content, frequency, and timing of monitoring and evaluation activities are inappropriate for the Agency. Rather, each Mission is required to establish a monitoring and evaluation system that complies with Agency and Bureau procedures and standards. Missions are required to issue a Mission Order or similar written procedures describing the organization and operation of this system, the responsibilities of Project Officers and the Mission Evaluation Officer, and procedures for reporting and following up on actions that are to be taken on the basis of evaluation recommendations.

AID/Washington regional and central 3ureaus are required to establish a complementary system to coordinate and support the monitoring and evaluation activities of their Missions and Offices. This system should incorporate the Bureau's information requirements into Mission or Office evaluation activities to the extent possible, support special evaluative studies, and provide guidance and assistance to Missions and Offices.

To ensure that adequate monitoring and evaluation is part of all AID-funded development activities, it is Agency policy that final planning documents for projects and programs must include an information plan specifying the data collection, monitoring, and evaluation activities to be conducted during implementation as well as the level of resources and other arrangements necessary to implement the information plan.

To ensure that adequate use is made of previous Agency experience and lessons learned, AID requires that relevant evaluation reports and special studies be reviewed as part of the design of new activities and that the documentation for new activities (e.g., Project Papers, Program Assistance Approval Documents [PAADs]) cite the reports used and indicate how the new activities have applied past experience in their design. In short, monitoring and evaluation, and the collection and analysis of empirical data, are to be an integral component of projects and programs and a key element in the management system for all AID-funded development activities.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF AID'S MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

SECTION SUMMARY: U.S. Federal requirements for accountability in the use of development assistance funds and for determining the effectiveness of development programs and projects mandate AID's monitoring and evaluation system. The primary purpose of AID's monitoring and evaluation system is to meet the information requirements of AID and host country development managers. An important objective of this system is to make monitoring and evaluation a cooperative development activity that strengthens the institutional capacity of host country agencies for this work.

The organization of AID's monitoring and evaluation system follows the decentralized management structure of the Agency. This allows the system to respond to the variety of information needs of managers at different organizational levels. Similarly, to cover the range of information needed by multiple users ti.e., managers), AID supports a variety of monitoring and evaluation methods and approaches.

Responsibility for planning and implementing monitoring and evaluation activities is divided among AID/Washington Bureaus and USAID Missions according to their respective functions, information requirements, and resources for such work. The Agency allows considerable flexibility in how each Bureau, Mission, and Office meets its monitoring and evaluation responsibilities. However, AID maintains basic standards for the quality and utility of monitoring and evaluation work and requires coordination among Bureaus, their Missions, and Offices regarding their respective information needs and monitoring and evaluation activities.

2.1 U.S. Government Requirements for Monitoring and Evaluation

U.S. Government standards for accountable management practices in all Federal agencies and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as amended) establish requirements for monitoring and evaluation of AID's development programs. AID must report to Congress on the effectiveness of foreign assistance and on the commitment of host country governments as reflected by progress toward meeting development objectives. Section 621a of the Act requires the Agency to follow accepted management practices in employing information systems and analytical techniques to support decision-making and the effectiveness of development assistance. AID's programming must be based on a system of clearly articulated objectives. The development activities the Agency supports should be the most effective means for achieving those objectives. This system should produce information "that relates agency resources, expenditures and budget projections to such objectives and results in order to assist in the evaluation of program performance, the review of budgetary requests, and the setting of program priorities."

Circular 117 of the Office of Management and Budget requires that AID assess the effectiveness and efficiency of development programs on a continuing basis. In short, AID is required by law and U.S. Government management standards to monitor and evaluate the use and results of development assistance to ensure that public funds are used as effectively as possible.

Because AID works cooperatively with host country governments, requirements for evaluation extend to the host countries receiving development assistance, as specified in loan or grant agreements. Moreover, adequate monitoring and evaluation depend on the cooperation and participation of the host country and recipient organization. In the final analysis, AID can best comply with monitoring and evaluation requirements when counterparts have a capacity and appreciation for such work.

2.2 The Management Focus of AID's Evaluation System

The primary purpose of monitoring and evaluation activities is to inform AID and host country development managers about the performance and progress of their projects and programs. This management focus makes monitoring and evaluation an integral part of the process of planning, implementation, and re-design.

AID's system must serve the information needs of multiple users--that is, various development managers. To a certain extent, some of the information requirements of these users/managers overlap and are complementary. However, information needs also vary across levels of management within AID and within the organizations with which it works. That is, each level of management requires certain types of information particular to its own responsibilities and operations. Consequently, different levels of management pose somewhat different questions for evaluation to address.

For example, over the course of a project, managers will need information about levels of inputs and outputs, expenditures, changes in the project environment or other external factors, the short-term effects of the project, and the sustainability of improvements resulting from the development effort. Although such information is often most immediately useful to Mission and project managers, it also has utility for AID/ Washington Bureaus. However, AID/Washington Bureaus need additional information about sectoral or cross-sectoral development issues, usually on a comparative basis involving a number of different countries, for the formulation of Agency policies or development strategies and for reporting to Congress on the overall contribution of AID programs to international development. The situation is even more complex when differences in information requirements among managers within Missions and within AID/Washington Bureaus are considered. For example, the program office of a Mission often needs sectoral or regional data for planning purposes, whereas project monitoring and evaluation activities typically focus on the project area and specific project components.

AID's system must be organized so that it can respond to the total range of information required by management. There must be mechanisms for identifying and clarifying the questions managers in USAID Missions and in AID/Washington Bureaus need answered. Priorities have to be established for these questions so that evaluation can be directed to the most important of management's information requirements. Moreover, because management's information needs are in part complementary and because some data can be used for more than one purpose, there must also be mechanisms for coordinating monitoring and evaluation activities within Missions and between AID/Washington and the field. In short, AID's management system must pose critical questions that can be answered given the resources available for monitoring and evaluation activities. AID's monitoring and evaluation system must, in turn, be able to collect the necessary data and provide the resulting information to managers.

2.3 AID's Decentralized Evaluation System

AID's evaluation system parallels the decentralized management structure of the Agency. Missions have greater authority for planning, review, and approval of their development programs than they had in the past. Mission accountability for sound management of resources has correspondingly increased. Both of these changes place greater importance on adequate monitoring and evaluation of projects and programs by individual Missions. But with less direct involvement in Mission operations, AID/Washington Bureaus must also make a more concerted effort to coordinate their information requirements with those of their respective Missions.

Just as management responsibilities for the Agency's overall program are divided among AID/Washington Bureaus and their field Missions, so too are responsibilities for evaluation. Differences between the functions and operations of AID/Washington Bureaus and those of USAID Missions (and, consequently, differences in the types of information managers in these units need) serve as a logical basis for organizing AID's evaluation system.

Sections 3 and 4 discuss in detail the specific requirements of Bureaus, Missions, and Offices in the Agency's evaluation system. The basic division of responsibilities follows directly from their respective information requirements and their respective capabilities for carrying out the activities necessary to secure the information.

At tne Mission level, managers have the most immediate need for information about implementation progress, the effects of projects, and the overall performance of the Mission's program. Therefore, monitoring and evaluation activities designed to support project and program planning, implementation, and subsequent modifications to initial designs and country strategies are principally the responsibility of USAID Missions.

The Missions' capacity for monitoring and evaluation work has definite limits. 50nstraints of time, funds, and skilled staff restrict Mission support for data collection and analysis to the host country and, in most cases, to specific regions of that country. Certain types of information needed by AID/ Washington and host country managers exceed these limits. In particular, regional 3ureaus responsible for program and project oversight, policy formulation, or broad programmatic planning typically need comparable information from all Missions in a region or fro,n a number of selected countries. In some cases, data from project and program evaluation can be pooled or synthesized from a number of different Missions and host countries. In other cases, special reporting systems or evaluative studies are required.

Clearly, AID/Washington Bureaus are in the best position to coordinate evaluation activities among Missions in order to obtain comparative data for AID/Washington senior managers or to support cross-national evaluative studies. Integrating the information needs of AID/Washington managers with the monitoring and evaluation activities of the Missions is a key part of the regional Bureaus' coordination function. Moreover, as part of AID/Washington's management oversight responsibilities, Bureaus are also the most appropriate location for establishing reporting procedures and standards and providing guidance for these activities.

It should be recognized that the division of evaluation responsibilities between AID/Washington and tne field contrasts sharply with more centralized approaches. That is, AID's monitoring and evaluation activities are not external to, or separate from, the operations of the unit needing the information. Nor is monitoring and evaluation solely the responsibility of a central evaluation office. Rather, each of the major organizational units of the Agency (i.e., regional and central Bureaus, Missions, and Offices) have responsibility for monitoring and evaluation activities commensurate with their information needs. The preparation, review, and approval of annual evaluation plans provide an opportunity to discuss similar and differing needs and to ensure that both will be addressed.

Despite the division of responsibilities between Bureaus and Missions, their operations fit together to form an evaluation system for the Agency. In particular, reporting requirements for evaluation plans and findings by Missions and Offices and the review process in Bureaus described in the following sections provide the integration and coordination necessary for a coherent Agency system.

2.4 Multiple Types of Evaluation Activities

Given the range of management information requirements, AID supports a variety of data collection and analysis activities. The same factors that influence the organization of AID's monitoring and evaluation system necessitate this diversified approach.

Federal requirements to assess the effectiveness of development assistance encompass a very diverse set of development efforts. The approach to monitoring and evaluating an agricultural production project with a clearly defined objective might not be appropriate for a program grant with broad policy reform objectives.

AID’s decentralized organization is also not amenable to a single monitoring and evaluation approach. For example, the types of information needed by a Mission are largely a reflection of the content of its portfolio and how much is known about the development constraints its program addresses. The best monitoring and evaluation approach for one Mission, therefore, may not necessarily be suitable or even feasible for other Missions.

In short, the variety of management’s questions, time constraints, available human and financial resources, and limited host country capabilities for data collection and analysis can only be accommodated through a multiplicity of monitoring and evaluation activities. The following sections describe these activities in more detail.

2.5 Host Country Collaboration in Evaluation

The Agency places considerable importance on making monitoring and evaluation a collaborative activity involving AID’s counterparts to the fullest extent possible. A major objective of U.S. foreign assistance is to strengthen host country institutional capabilities to carry out national development programs. The capability to collect and analyze useful data on a timely basis to guide decision-making is certainly a key component of such institution building. At the very least, it contributes to more effective planning and investment of development resources by the host country. Therefore, AID’s monitoring and evaluation activities provide an excellent opportunity for improving the capabilities of host country counterpart organizations to collect, analyze, and use data.

A cooperative approach to evaluation is also consistent with AID’s mode of operation in providing development assistance to a country. AID’s mandate is to work collaboratively with its host country counterparts. To do so requires a basis of mutual understanding and general agreement on which development activities represent the best investment of development resources. Once these activities are underway, agreement on the direction, progress, and possible need for changes is equally important for effective implementation. A collaborative approach to monitoring and evaluation can contribute to this process by providing a common information base for AID and host country managers. Moreover, the findings of evaluation will have more credibility for host country managers if they have had a direct role in carrying out these activities.

AID relies heavily on the cooperation of its host country counterparts to collect or make available the types of data necessary to meet requirements for adequate monitoring and evaluation of development projects and programs. This work is often performed by an appropriate office within the line ministry or host country agency responsible for project implementation. Certainly, routine data about levels of outputs, service delivery, operating costs, and other basic performance measures are often available only from the host country implementing organization.

The collaborative approach also has a major implication for AID and the host country at the planning stage. Data collection and analysis for monitoring and evaluation can quickly exceed the host country organization's existing capabilities for such work. Even though AID may provide technical assistance and training, the monitoring and evaluation requirements of projects and programs must be designed to fit within existing capabilities if participation and cooperation by the host country are to occur.

3. AID'S EVALUATION PROCEDURES

SECTION SUMMARY: This section describes the major steps in AID's evaluation system concerning the actions to be taken by Missions, Offices, and Bureaus. The major steps are as follows:

- Using past experience in the design of new activities
- Incorporating an information component (i.e., a plan for data collection and analysis activities to support monitoring and evaluation) in the design of new activities
- Deciding when to evaluate and in what form
- Planning an evaluation: what to evaluate
- Writing an evaluation scope of work
- Backstopping the evaluation: Mission or Office responsibilities
- Completing the evaluation process: internal review, debriefing, the AID Evaluation Summary, submission requirements, and Bureau review
- Making evaluations useful: Mission or Office follow-up on evaluation recommendations

3.1 Using Past Experience in Designing New Activities

AGENCY REQUIREMENT: AID requires the use of relevant past experience in the design of new activities, and evidence in the design document that the designers have considered and applied this experience.

Information on the effectiveness and experience of specific project and program approaches of AID and other donors is increasingly documented and available. AID officers and counterparts should build on this experience. Bureaus and Missions with delegated authority to approve new activities should ensure that design teams draw on relevant previous experience in designing new activities, demonstrate how this experience is taken into account in elements of the design, and cite specific sources used. Bureaus and Missions should include this requirement as a standard issue for discussion during reviews preceding approval of new projects. Missions can request available material on specific pertinent experience of AID and other donors from their Bureau and from the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Center for Development Information and Evaluation (PPC/CDIE) for consideration by design teams and counterparts.

3.2 Incorporating an Information Component in Project Designs

AGENCY REQUIREMENT: AID requires that all projects include an information component (Information Plan) that will provide the data necessary for adequate monitoring and evaluation during implementation. This component should provide timely information to managers on progress and effects, to support improved project performance.

Past experience indicates that the best way to ensure that data for monitoring and evaluation are collected and analyzed is to integrate data-related activities into the overall design and, in particular, into the project's management plan. In other words, data collection and analysis should be treated as a project component. Therefore, AID requires that all activities (e.g., projects, nonproject loans and grants) include an Information Plan that describes how managers will obtain the types of data they require for monitoring and evaluation during inplementation. The Information Plan should enable managers to obtain timely, rapid feedback data on interim effects as part of project monitoring (ongoing evaluation), rather than limiting the collection and analysis of such data to a one-shot evaluation exercise. The detail of the Information Plan depends on the nature of the particular development activity. More comprehensive plans are needed when the project is:

- A core activity within the Mission's portfolio
- An experimental effort (e.g., pilot projects)

- A long-term, multiphase effort requiring several interim evaluations

- Likely to have a significant impact on a large number of beneficiaries or has the potential for producing additional positive or negative effects difficult to predict during the initial design

- Likely to have important implications for other aspects of the U.S. development program (e.g., policy dialogue).

3.2.1 Project Identification Document

Preliminary planning for the information component of the project should be presented in the Project Identification Document (PID). This might include a brief discussion of the anticipated information requirements, key management questions, the types of issues that need to be addressed by the Information Plan in the Project Paper, and requirements for a management information or evaluation specialist as a member of the design team.

3.2.2 Project Paper

The Information Plan for Project Papers and similar program design documents (e.g., PAADs) should cover the following topics:

- The users of the information. List host country, borrower or grantee organization, USAID Mission, AID/Washington, and other users.

- Principal objectives and other issues that generate the information requirements for the project. Describe the purpose, goal, and overall program objectives of the project as presented in the Project Paper or similar document.

- Priority information needs. List key decision points and corresponding management questions that must be addressed during implementation.

- The management information system (MIS). Discuss (1) key variables or indicators that will be tracked periodically to address management's needs and (2) data sources and/or data collection methods that will be used (e.g., administrative records, rapid low-cost surveys and case studies, special studies).

- Host country participation. State which implementing agencies will be involved and discuss their existing institutional capability for data collection and analysis, training and technical assistance needs, and other institutional arrangements or organizational changes involved with implementing the Information Plan.

- Operation of the MIS. Describe the flow of information from data sources to managers, taking into consideration data processing and analysis requirements, data presentation or formats for use by nonspecialists (i.e., managers), time constraints, and feedback from management about needed improvements to the system.

- Budget. (1) Include AID funding necessary to implement the Information Plan as a line item in the overall project budget. A detailed budget for the information component should cover shortand long-term technical advisers; in-country and third-country training costs; commodities (e.g., computers, supplies, furniture, vehicles); and anticipated needs for non-AID evaluators to be funded from the project. The budget should include some contingency funding for information requirements likely to arise during implementation. (2) Specify host country contribution, including staff, office space, and other operating expenses for monitoring and evaluation activities.

- Estimated evaluation requirements. (1) Estimated timing-schedule for evaluations; Prepare a schedule to ensure that findings and recommendations are available to managers prior to major anticipated decision points. (2) Type: Specify whether interim evaluations will be internal, process evaluations conducted primarily by project staff or external evaluations conducted primarily by nonproject staff (e.g., short-term contractors). (3) Data requirements for the evaluations: State the types of data that will be needed and who has responsibility for providing the evaluators with the types of data they will need.[4]

[4]For a more detailed discussion of information planning during project design, see Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plans for AID-Assisted Projects, AID Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report No. 9, 1987.

3.3 Deciding When To Evaluate and in What Form

AGENCY REQUIREMENT: Managers must determine when interim, final, or ex post evaluations are needed to address problems and issues that are beyond the scope of ongoing evaluation. The frequency of interim evaluations and the need for final evaluations will depend on the nature of the activity and managelnent's need for information.

The major factor in determining when to evaluate is the need for evaluative information to guide key upcoming decisions about the future irnplementation of the project or program. AID requires that such information be available prior to these decisions and that it be used to substantiate decisions and actions taken. Final evaluations are required when a follow-on project is anticipated. The Mission's or Office's Annual Evaluation Plan (see Section 3.3.3) describes when and why evaluations will be conducted. Another major factor in determining when to evaluate is the contribution of the evaluation process itself to improved cornmunication and policy dialogue with AID recipients during key junctures in implementation and program development.

3.3.1 Initially Estimated Evaluation Requirements

The Information Plan for AID projects should estimate when key decision points will occur during implementation. These decisions usually concern the future inplementation of the activity and modifications to improve project performance. For example, in many-projects, certain components cannot be fully planned during the initial design and are intentionally left as issues to be resolved later. After 2 or 3 years of implementation, an interim evaluation would be a useful way to deal with these issues, in effect completing the initial project design. Another critical decision point that can be anticipated during the design of the project is the need for evaluation when follow-on activities are likely, such as in multiphase projects. Similarly, key decision points that require evaluative information occur periodically in performance disbursement designs, such as policy reform programs.

For these critical junctures in the project, managers will often need additional information or assistance from outside specialists available through an evaluation. As described above, the Information Plan for a project should estimate the requirements for periodic evaluations drawing on the data generated by the project. Section 3.2 cites several types of development activities that will typically require more frequent or extensive evaluation.

3.3.2 Decisions Based on Implementation Progress

The Information Plan for a project provides only a tentative schedule for evaluations, whereas the actual course of implementation should determine when evaluations are actually needed. In some cases, the Information Plan may have correctly estimated when an interim or final evaluation is needed. But any number of unanticipated events can alter the pace of implementation and management's need for information, thus delaying or accelerating the evaluation schedule.

Moreover, an effective management information system should surface issues and problems for managers. In many instances, information to resolve these questions can be obtained through short surveys or rapid, low-cost studies that could not have been predicted in the initial information plan but which are necessary for ongoing evaluation. In other instances, the information needed may require an interim evaluation. Another possibility is that for program purposes, senior Mission or Office managers determine that an evaluation of a particularly important project may provide useful information for program or sector strategy planning. In short, managers must determine when to evaluate based on their current need for information.

3.3.3 Annual Evaluation Plan

Missions are required to prepare an Annual Evaluation Plan that provides the schedule of project evaluations and other evaluative studies over a 2-year period (see Section 4.1.2). This requirement may be waived in special cases (e.g., small country programs).

Although the Annual Evaluation Plan may consist largely of project evaluations, it should also address any program and sectoral information requirements. The development of its Annual Evaluation Plan is the occasion for a Mission or Office to identify broader questions of concern to senior managers (e.g., questions related to its Action Plan or to program and policy performance relative to strategic objectives) and to prepare for appropriate assessments that address these questions. Information needs for program, policy, or sector assessments and planning are often met through project or multiproject evaluations. Therefore, decisions about conducting an evaluation must take into consideration these higher level information needs.

Similarly, the Annual Evaluation Plan alerts AID/ Washington Bureaus to upcoming evaluations that may be of particular importance to their program and policy responsibilities. Annual Evaluation Plans of Missions and Offices are reviewed and approved in AID/Washington and incorporated into respective Bureau Annual Evaluation Plans. Before rescheduling or eliminating an evaluation, any effects this decision might have on the Bureau's access to evaluative information should be considered. Some project evaluations might be conducted primarily to meet these higher level information requirements. The submission of Annual Evaluation Plans follows guidance issued annually by AID/Washington.

3.3.4 Deciding Not To Evaluate

The decision to conduct an evaluation, especially when contracted evaluators will be used, must be given careful thought. In many instances, the decision not to evaluate a project is perfectly legitimate. When implementation is proceeding as scheduled and managers already have empirical information from project information systems and ongoing evaluation about progress and effects or, conversely, when managers are very much aware of problems affecting the project, and their causes and possible solutions, an evaluation may not add much to what is already known. Even when a project is experiencing serious implementation problems, an interim evaluation is only one among several possible options. The same reasoning applies to decisions about final evaluations. If the project has generated documentation concerning its progress and effects (e.g., from ongoing and interim evaluations, project files), raises no significant development issues, and no follow-on activities are anticipated, the Project Assistance Completion Report (PACR--see Section 3.3.5[3]) may be sufficient to close out the project.

However, the option not to evaluate should not be abused as an excuse to avoid necessary evaluations. Responsible managers may want to conduct an interim evaluation at least once during the course of implementation, if for no other reason than to reaffirm what they think they know about the performance and effectiveness of the project. Moreover, the process of an evaluation and the use of external evaluators may be the most effective way to promote policy dialogue and to draw project staff and counterpart managers into an appreciation of the need for action. If funding is a constraint, there are forms of evaluation, such as the special studies planned as part of the the project's information system and internal, process evaluations, which use local staff and entail little or no additional costs other than staff time.

3.3.5 Forms of Evaluation

AID's monitoring and evaluation system includes a number of different activities to generate necessary information. Some are built into the design of the project as part of the management information system, whereas others are conducted as needed. The following describes the monitoring and evaluation activities that AID supports.

1. Ongoing monitoring and evaluation. AID requires that the information component included in all projects obtain the types of routine data needed by management to track implementation progress, performance, and interim effects. This includes financial accounting data, levels of inputs and outputs, and a limited number of key indicators that measure the main objectives of the development activity. (In the case of projects, for example, these objectives are identified at the output, purpose, and goal levels of the Logical Framework.) Administrative or operational records, small-scale surveys, and rapid, low-cost studies are the most common sources of data for ongoing evaluation (see Section 3.3.6).[5]

2. Interim evaluations. Interim evaluations are typically conducted for the following reasons:

- To resolve issues that were identified during the initial planning process but could not be resolved until implementation had proceeded to a specific stage
- To find solutions to major or persistent problems affecting implementation
- To review actual versus planned progress toward the outputs, purpose, and goal of projects
- To review progress to date as required by phased or performance disbursement designs for decisions about continued funding or design modifications
- To reassess the relevance of project objectives to the host country's and AID's development program or strategy
- To facilitate or promote policy dialogue
- To improve the efficiency or reduce the costs of project activities
- To review assumptions made during project design and determine their continued validity

---

[5]Small surveys, special studies, and other rapid, low-cost methods to support ongoing evaluation will usually be carried out for a project manager by a contracted specialist. Guidelines for writing a scope of work to obtain this kind of information are contained in Selecting Data Collection Methods and Preparing Contractor Scopes of Work, AID Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report No. 3, August 1985.

- To estimate the short-term effects and the probability for sustained impact of the project

- To document factors accounting for success or failure

There are two types of interim evaluation: internal, process evaluations that are performed primarily by project staff, and external evaluations that involve outside specialists to provide additional insight into the problems or issues being evaluated. Table 1 summarizes the trade-offs between internal and external evaluators.

3. Project Assistance Completion Reports and final evaluations. A Project Assistance Completion Report (PACR) is required for all projects. The AID officer who closes out the project should summarize the final level of inputs and outputs provided through the activity, end-of-project status regarding achievement of objectives (using data from ongoing and interim evaluations), an estimate of the sustainability of development accomplishments, and lessons learned from this particular project as guidance for future similar development activities.

Some projects require a final evaluation that examines the same topics as those covered by a PACR, but in much greater depth by external evaluators and in relation to the issues and questions posed by the sponsor. Final evaluations are required when a follow-on activity is anticipated to a project nearing completion. In all other cases, unless the Bureau needs information on key issues or questions that require a final evaluation, the Mission or Office has the option of deciding whether to conduct final evaluations. For example, when a significant amount of information useful for planning future development activities could be obtained from a final evaluation, or when the evaluation process itself would promote or facilitate policy dialogue, then the evaluation is justified. The requirement for a PACR may be waived if a final evaluation is conducted.

4. Ex Post evaluations. Ex post evaluations are conducted after project completion and typically focus on the effects and impacts--both positive and negative--produced by the activity on the intended beneficiaries. Particular attention is given to the economic, social, and political factors that facilitated or impeded the development impact and the sustainability of the improvements resulting from the project.

The Impact Evaluation Series sponsored by PPC/CDIE examines a set of identical or similar projects (e.g., small-scale irrigation, potable water, rural roads) in a number of different countries. The series provides comparative information about sectoral or cross-cutting development issues that can improve future planning of similar projects.

Table 1. Trade-Offs Between Internal and External Evaluators

Someone From Inside	Someone From Outside
Advantages	
• Knows the organization, its program and operations	• May be free from organizational bias
• Is not an adversary	• May bring fresh perspective, insight, broader experience, and recent state-of-the-art knowledge
• Has a greater chance of adopting/following up on recommendations	• Is more easily hired for intensive work
• Is often less expensive	• Can serve as an arbitrator or facilitator between parties
• Is familiar with AID's evaluation procedures	
• Doesn't require time-consuming procurement negotiations	
• Has more opportunity to build host country evaluation capability	
Disadvantages	
• May avoid looking for facts or forming conclusions that are negative or reflect badly on organization/ individuals	• May not know the organization, its policies and procedures/regulations
• Tends to accept the assumptions of the organization	• May be ignorant of constraints on feasibility of recommendations
• Is usually too busy to participate fully	• May be perceived as an adversary, arousing unnecessary anxiety
• May be constrained by organizational role conflict	• May be expensive (unless contracted locally)
	• Requires more time for contract negotiations, orientation, and monitoring
	• Can't follow up on recommendations

• May be unfamiliar with local political, cultural, and economic environment

5. Program reviews, sector assessments, and multiproject evaluations. AID conducts a variety of special studies, such as sector assessments or multiproject evaluations, to obtain information on issues not typically addressed by evaluations of single projects. AID's experience with certain types of projects or development problems can assist Agency managers to formulate policy in critical areas or to plan broad programmatic strategies. Such studies can be particularly useful in providing information about types of development problems w/th which AID has had little previous experience but intends to address in the future. These studies are usually necessary to obtain a comprehensive assessment of progress toward desired program outcomes, policy changes, or benchmarks toward the achievement of country or program strategy objectives.

3.3.6 Data Sources for Evaluations

Data requirements for an evaluation obviously depend on the form of evaluation to be conducted and the questions to be answered. Project records and data from project information systems are standard sources of information for evaluations, but additional data are often required. Most AID evaluations involve relatively simple social science methods of data collection and analysis--for example, informal interviews, small-scale surveys, case studies, use of available statistical data, and summaries or syntheses of preceding studies. Table 2 summarizes the common sources of data for evaluation.[6]

3.4 Planning an Evaluation: What To Evaluate

AGENCY REQUIREMENT: AID requires that evaluations be designed to answer questions concerning the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of AID-assisted development activities.

---

[6]Complex, multivariate surveys and randomized experimental designs for evaluating projects have usually not provided useful, timely information for AID managers and planners (see Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plans for AID-Assisted Projects, AID Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report No. 9, 1987).

Table 2. Sources of Information and Data for AID Evaluations

Internal Sources	External Sources
<u>Secondary and Contextual Data</u> (Usually available in AID/ Washington or at the USAID Mission) • AID Policy Papers (as pertinent) • CDSS and Regional Strategies • PIDs and Project Papers • Project files (monthly reports, prior evaluations, memos, letters, cables) • Project Papers and evaluations of similar AID projects • Sector Assessments	<u>Secondary and Contextual Data</u> (Often available at the USAID Mission, the U.S. Embassy, or from counterpart agencies, other donors, etc.) • Host country development plans and policies • Host country project records, reports • Private sector organizations' reports • Books, periodicals, and journals • Research studies • Other bilateral/multilateral donor project and program documentation • Informant reports/expert opinions • World Bank reports/studies
<u>Primary Data</u> (Available at the USAID Mission or can be obtained through the host government) • Sector survey data • Periodic data collected against key indicators • Host country, USAID Mission, contractor, and project beneficiary interviews	<u>Primary Data</u> (Often unavailable or inadequate, unless the project design specifically provides for collection during project implementation) <u>Observation</u> Participant or non-participant; could be developed as part of regular site visits by project staff <u>Survey</u> Through interviews or by using structured questionnaires <u>Other</u> • Case studies of before/after conditions • Record-keeping by project staff in the form ofjournals, etc. • Group sessions to stimulate discus-sion on project experience and lessons learned

Source: <u>Asia Near East Bureau Procedural Guidelines for Evaluation</u>, February 1986, p.12.

After the decision has been made to conduct an evaluation, the AID Project Officer (or other officer assigned responsibility for the evaluation) must develop a clear statement of work for the evaluation team. Specifying clearly and exactly the questions to be examined by the evaluation and answered in the evaluation report is critical. These questions depend largely on the type of project to be evaluated, its stage of implementation, and the issues or problems that need to be resolved. However, AID requires that evaluations examine several broad concerns that are applicable to virtually any type of development assistance. These are the following:

- Relevance. Are the development constraints the project was initially designed to address major problems that are germane to the current development strategies supported by AID?

- Effectiveness. Is the project achieving satisfactory progress toward its stated objectives?

- Efficiency. Are the effects of the project being produced at an acceptable cost compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same objectives?

- Impact. What positive and negative effects are resulting from the project?

- Sustainability. Are the effects of the project likely to become sustainable development impacts--that is, will they continue after AID funding has stopped?

These issues help focus evaluations on the major concerns of development managers. They force evaluators to go beyond mere examination of inputs and outputs and think about the more important questions of why the project is or is not having anticipated effects, what can be done to improve the overall performance of the activity, and what can be done to ensure that this investment produces enduring benefits. Attention to these issues makes the evaluation process useful in promoting policy dialogue.

3.5 Writing an Evaluation Scope of Work

AGENCY REQUIREMENT: AID requires that evaluation scopes of work contain the following sections: (1) activity to be evaluated, (2) purpose of the evaluation, (3) background of the activity, (4) evaluation questions, (5) methods and procedures, (6) team composition, (7) reporting requirements, and (8) funding. Reporting requirements must specify that the evaluation report will contain an executive summary stating the findings (evidence), conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation. Compliance with the scope of work is mandatory for final payment for contractor-conducted evaluations. (Additional requirements for each section of the scope of work are specified below.)

The scope of work is critical to obtaining the types of information needed. It must articulate as clearly and precisely as possible the questions managers need addressed through an evaluation. For the evaluation team, a good scope of work directs them to the key issues and problems of the activity to be evaluated. Experience clearly demonstrates that the time and effort required for writing a sound scope of work acceptable to host country as well as AID managers is easily justified by improvements in the quality, utility, and acceptance of the evaluation results.

AID officers are reminded that certification of the voucher for payment for contractor-conducted evaluations requires that the evaluation report conform to the conditions stipulated in the scope of work.

An evaluation scope of work must include the following sections:

1. Activity to be evaluated. Identify the activity or activities to be evaluated. For projects, this would include the authorization number, title, cost, life-of-project dates, and most recent project assistance completion date (PACD). Modify accordingly if only specific components or multiple projects are to be evaluated.

2. Purpose of the evaluation. Specify the reason(s) the evaluation is needed, key management issues to be addressed, who will use the results of the evaluation, and how the evaluation findings and recommendations will be used.

3. Background. Describe the history and current implementation status of the project, including the names of agencies and organizations involved, in no more than two pages.

4. Statement of work. Cite the specific questions the evaluation is to address using language that requires answers based on empirical evidence rather than subjective interpretation. Avoid vague terminology open to various interpretations. If terms such as "adequate," "sufficient," "relevant," and the like have to be used, specify what constitutes "adequate," "sufficient," or "relevant". State 5 to 10 questions in an order indicating their importance to management. Specify that the evaluation report is to provide empirical findings to answer these questions, conclusions (interpretations and judgments) that are based on the findings, and recommendations based on an assessment of the results of the evaluation exercise. Also specify that the report is to provide lessons learned that may emerge from the analysis.

5. Methods and procedures. Specify the data collection and analysis methods to be used by the evaluation team. In many cases, the questions posed for the evaluation (and even their wording) indicate the types of methods that are suitable for the study. Funding for the evaluation also detenmines what types of research methods can be used. In short, required methods should be consistent with the evaluation questions and should be feasible given available funding.

Specify procedural matters in this section, including timing or phasing of the team's work; requirements for working 6-day weeks or holidays; preparatory work in the United States, such as document reviews or interviews; local conditions that may affect the study, such as logistics, communications, working hours, location of and access to pertinent data; and social or cultural factors that may influence interviewing procedures.

6. Evaluation team composition. Specify requirements for language proficiency, areas of technical competency, previous in-country work experience, and male/female team composition, as necessary. The nature of activity and the focus of the evaluation questions should determine the composition of the evaluation team. In general, an evaluation team requires technical specialists as well as at least one evaluation specialist. AID strongly encourages the use of multidisciplinary teams. A social scientist with field research experience or a management specialist with development project experience can often serve as the evaluation specialist.

To avoid conflicts of interest, final or ex post evaluation teams must be composed entirely of individuals with no previous connection (from initial design through implementation) with the activity being evaluated. This includes both U.S. and host country personnel. Combining project staff with outside evaluators is encouraged for interim process evaluations. Outsiders working with project staff can quickly "get up to speed" on the objectives and present status of the project. Project staff benefit from the disinterested perspective outsiders bring to the evaluation. This also adds to the perceived legitimacy of the evaluation and facilitates more rapid use of the findings and recommendations.

Including AID direct-hire staff on evaluation teams who are not associated with the project, either from other Missions or from AID/Washington, and who have the necessary skills and experience specified in the scope of work is encouraged whenever possible. Their participation serves as a direct link to Agency operations, expediting the transfer of experience and lessons learned from the evaluation.

7. Reporting requirements. Specify reporting requirements, including when draft and final versions ot- the evaluation report are due.

AID's required format for evaluation reports is as follows:

- Executive Summary
- Project Identification Data Sheet (see Appendix A)
- Table of Contents
- Body of the Report
- Appendixes

The executive summary states the development objectives of the activity evaluated; purpose of the evaluation; study method; findings, conclusions, and recommendations; and lessons learned about the design and implementation of this type of development activity. (See Appendix B for more detailed instructions.)

The body of the report should include discussion of (1) the purpose and study questions of the evaluation; (2) the economic, political, and social context of the project; (3) team composition and study methods (one page maximum); (4) evidence/findings of the study concerning the evaluation questions; (5) conclusions drawn from the findings, stated in succinct language; and (6) recommendations based on the study findings and conclusions, stated as actions to be taken to improve project performance. A page limit must be stated for the body of the report--usually 30 to 40 pages is sufficient--with more detailed discussions of methodological or technical issues placed in appendixes.

Appendixes should include a copy of the evaluation scope of work, the most current Logical Framework as pertinent, a list of documents consulted, and individuals and agencies contacted. Additional appendixes may include a brief discussion of study methodology and technical topics if necessary.

Reporting requirements in the scope of work may also include (1) a schedule that relates submission of drafts to completion of fieldwork and other research; (2) the stipulation that the evaluation team leader complete the abstract and narrative sections of the AID Evaluation Summary form; (3) responsibility of the team leader for submitting the final revised evaluation report, with additional time allocated to the contract for this work; (4) translation of the report or portions of it; and (5) debriefings by the evaluation team or team leader with AID and counterpart staff.

8. Funding. Estimate the cost and source of funds for the evaluation. Include funds for in-country travel, translators, interviewers, and other additional costs beyond evaluation team expenses.

3.6 Backstopping the Evaluation: Mission or Office Responsibilities

3.6.1 Preliminary Planning

Because of the lead time built into AID's contracting process, detailed planning for conducting an evaluation should begin soon after the decision to evaluate has been made. Less planning time is required when AID and host country staff conduct an internal, process evaluation. However, much of the planning for internal and external evaluations, particularly developing a clear scope of work with specific evaluation questions, is very similar.

Preliminary planning is necessary in order to (1) obtain host country approval of the timing and evaluation scope of work, (2) select qualified evaluators, (3) arrange for logistical and other support services, (4) ensure that the team reviews project documents and other pertinent literature and has access to other relevant data, (5) prepare for the Team Planning Meeting, and (6) alert officials and others associated with the project that they will be contacted by the evaluation team. The AID officer must set aside sufficient time for such planning and preparations if the evaluation is to succeed.

The following is a generic checklist of preliminary activities involved with planning the implementation of an evaluation. (The indicated lead times are only suggestive; actual lead times will depend on contracting requirements.)

1. As soon as the decision to evaluate has been made

    - Assign responsibility for conducting the evaluation.

    - Reach agreement with counterparts on the purpose of the evaluation, a schedule for the evaluation, and their role in the evaluation.

    - Reserve funds for the evaluation.

2. Three months prior to the evaluation

    - Develop with counterparts, or at least obtain their approval of, a scope of work for the evaluation, identifying key questions, personnel, timing, and preliminary literature reviews.

    - Identify potential sources for evaluators (e.g., AID/Washington, host country agencies, contract firms) and a facilitator for the Evaluation Team Planning Meeting, if appropriate.

- Set an exact time for the evaluation, taking into account schedules and events (e.g., local holidays, elections) that might interfere with the timely completion of the evaluation.

- Draft a Project Implementation Order/Technical Services (PIO/T) if necessary and obtain review by pertinent Mission Office(s).

3. One to two months prior to the evaluation

   - Issue the final PIO/T

     - When an 8(a) firm or a personal services contract exceeding $10,000 is involved, send the PIO/T to the Contracts Office at least 8 weeks before the start of the evaluation.

     - When planning to use firms through an existing indefinite quantity contract (IQC), send the PIO/T to the Contracts Office at least 4 weeks before the start of the evaluation.

   - Track the progress of the PIO/T to ensure that any problems are resolved so that a contract will be in place before the evaluation is to begin.

4. One month prior to the evaluation

   - Collect and organize pertinent documents and information for the evaluation team.

   - Review plans for the Evaluation Team Planning Meeting.

   - Secure arrangements and funds for secretarial services, office space, vehicles, hotel reservations, and any other support for the evaluation.

   - Obtain host country clearances for team members and letters of identification explaining their association with the USAID Mission.

   - Develop a preliminary itinerary, and schedule appointments for the evaluation team.

5. Ten days prior to the evaluation team’s arrival

   - Reconfirm arrangements, appointments, and other scheduled activities planned for the team.

   - Have all documents needed by the team available for use, and make copies of those needed by each team member. Documentation should include the Project Paper, project agreements, contractual documents, prior evaluations, implementation reports, project monitoring data, annual workplans, sector assessments, audits, and the project files (if unclassified).

6. Upon arrival of the evaluation team

- Discuss with the team the purpose and objectives of the evaluation to ensure mutual understanding. The team should be briefed on the following details:

  - Project background
  - How the project addresses overall sector goals
  - The organization and operation of the project
  - Project status and progress to date
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - The evaluation scope of work
  - Host country or grantee participation in the evaluation
  - Relevant AID and regional bureau evaluation requirements
  - Logistical support and other arrangements

- Accompany team on introductory meetings with Mission, host country, and other staff associated with the activity being evaluated.

3.6.2 Support During the Evaluation

A Team Planning Meeting is highly recommended for orienting the evaluation team, particularly when the evaluation will be conducted by several outside evaluators or when there is considerable disagreement about design and implementation issues among AID, host country, grantee organization, and other project staff. Team Planning Meetings help the evaluation team members to understand more clearly their specific responsibilities and to organize themselves into an effective unit, working with one another to accomplish what has to be done. A basic consensus among the team members concerning the objectives of their assignments will expedite work on the evaluation and contribute to producing a useful report.7

Once work begins on the evaluation, it is important that the AID officer assigned responsibility for the evaluation provide support and assistance to the evaluation team so that they can complete their assignments and produce a sound evaluation report. Periodic and open communication with the team should be maintained throughout the evaluation process. However, when the AID officer is not an actual team member, too much direct involvement should be avoided so as not to bias the results of the evaluation.

3.7 Completing the Evaluation

AGENCY REQUIREMENT: An evaluation report and a completed AID Evaluation Summary are required for all interim and final evaluations. For Mission-initiated evaluations, copies of the report and the Evaluation Summary are to be submitted to AID/Washington Offices as required by each regional Bureau, and to PPC/CDIE. For AID/Washington-initiated evaluations, copies of the report and the AID Evaluation Summary are to be distributed to other AID Offices concerned with the sector or country, and to PPC/CDIE. The instructions for completing the AID Evaluation Summary provide further detail on how to submit evaluation reports and how to order additional copies of the form.

3.7.1 Internal Review of Evaluation Reports

The evaluation scope of work should stipulate the reporting requirements and schedule for drafts by the evaluation team (see Section 3.5).[7] Depending on the complexity of the evaluation issues, the Mission and counterparts may choose to review a preliminary draft of the report to ensure that the team has a factually correct understanding of the project. Comments should be given to the team so they can incorporate corrections in the final version of the report. A review of a preliminary draft, especially for external evaluations, should not be abused by Mission and counterpart staff as an opportunity to unduly influence the team's interpretation of evidence and findings. Such efforts would defeat the purpose of the evaluation, which is to get an "outside, unbiased" assessment of the project. When a review of a preliminary draft is required, the scope of work should include additional time for the team members, particularly the team leader, who is responsible for submitting the final version of the report.

The final evaluation report should be reviewed thoroughly by project managers and other Mission technical staff. A review by senior Mission managers should also be conducted. The Mission Evaluation Officer working with the AID officer assigned responsibility for the evaluation should organize Mission-level reviews to include all pertinent Mission staff. AID/ Washington Offices sponsoring an evaluation should organize a similar review.

The purpose of the review is to communicate to senior managers information about implementation progress, problems encountered, the likelihood of achieving the overall objectives, and unanticipated factors or other changes affecting the project. On the basis of this information, decisions can be made about changes in design or implementation strategy as recommended by the evaluation. Proposed changes should then serve as a basis of discussions with counterparts. In short, the review informs AID and counterpart managers about the

---

[7]For more information on Team Planning Meetings, see Facilitator Guide for Conducting a Team Planning Meeting, WASH Technical Report No. 32, November 1985.

status of the project and facilitates constructive responses to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation.

3.7.2 AID Evaluation Summary

In addition to the evaluation report, the "final" product of an AID evaluation includes a completed AID Evaluation Summary form (this form replaces the the previous Project Evaluation Summary [PES]). The AID Evaluation Summary consists of two parts. Part 1 includes a schedule of the actions to be taken on the basis of evaluation results, listing who is responsible for the actions and when they are to be completed. It also includes a short abstract of the evaluation report and data on the cost of the evaluation.

Part 2 consists of a more detailed summary of evaluation findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned; comments by the Mission or AID/Washington Office sponsoring the evaluation; and attachments, including a copy of the evaluation report.

The AID officer responsible for the evaluation is required to complete the AID Evaluation Summary form. The Mission Evaluation Officer is responsible for ensuring that the AID Evaluation Summary is completed and submitted. The evaluation team may be assigned the task of completing the abstract and detailed summary portions of the form; this should be stipulated in the scope of work under Reporting Requirements.

3.7.3 Reporting Requirements

All evaluation reports must be submitted as stipulated in the instructions for the AID Evaluation Summary and according to Bureau requirements. Evaluation documents must be submitted within 60 days of receipt of the "final version" of the evaluation report prepared by contractors or by Agency staff. If the AID Evaluation Summary form cannot include all counterpart follow-up actions within 60 days because discussions with counterparts are prolonged, the Mission or Office should submit copies of the final evaluation report and an AID Evaluation Summary that lists preliminary actions to be taken by the AID Mission or Office.

3.7.4 AID/Washington Review

Bureaus should establish an evaluation tracking and review system as part of their management oversight operations. Missions and Offices are directed to their Bureau Evaluation Offices for clarification of these review procedures.

Bureaus may conduct informal and formal reviews of evalua- tion reports depending on the importance of the project involved, the problems and issues addressed by the evaluation, and the types of changes recommended by the evaluation. Informal reviews include team debriefings, technical reviews of draft evaluation reports for Bureau-sponsored evaluations, and desk reviews of evaluations that raise no important issues or lessons learned and require no follow-up action by AID/Washington Offices. Usually initiated by the project backstop officer, formal reviews involve a project Review Committee and, in some exceptional cases, a meeting of senior-level managers.

In general, a more rigorous review of evaluations is conducted for projects that are a major element in the Mission's or Office's portfolio or that have significance for other Missions, Bureau strategies, or Agency policies. At a minimum, reviews should consider the quality of the evaluation, particularly with regard to (1) the adequacy of the methods followed to obtain data for the evaluation, (2) the validity of the evidence upon which conclusions and recommendation are based, (3) the soundness of the professional judgment evidenced in the report, (4) the utility of the recommendations and lessons learned, and (5) the submission of all required documentation.

All evaluation reviews should be conducted and completed (as appropriate, including a reporting cable to the Mission) within 60 days of receipt of the evaluation report and AID Evaluation Summary. (When a preliminary draft of the evaluation report is reviewed in AID/Washington, the AID Evaluation Summary is not required at the time of the review, but should accompany the final version of the report.)

Reporting cables to Missions concerning the results of the evaluation review should (1) summarize important issues raised and distinguish them from secondary points, (2) discuss the adequacy of the evaluation (if this is an issue), and (3) recommend or suggest follow-up actions, as appropriate.

3.8 Making Evaluations Useful: Follow-up on Evaluation Recommendations

> AGENCY REQUIREMENT: The Mission or AID/Washington Office that sponsored the evaluation is required to respond to the recommendations for action presented in the evaluation report. This response may be a complete or partial acceptance of a recommendation, a proposed alternative action that accomplishes the same objective, or rejection of a recommendation. The course of action to be followed must be stated in Part 1, and rejection or modification of recommendations must be explained in Part 2 of the AID Evaluation Summary. Missions and Offices sponsoring an evaluation are required to establish a system for following up on the decided course of action in response to evaluation recommendations to ensure that these actions are implemented.

The primary purpose for conducting an evaluation is to obtain information that can help managers improve the performance and effectiveness of the activity. Therefore, the evaluation process is not complete until action has been taken on the recommendations of the evaluation report. The options are (1) complete or partial implementation of the recommendation, (2) implementation of an alternative action that accomplishes the same result, or (3) a well-justified decision to not accept the recommendation. The last option--rejecting a recommendation--is not an excuse for inaction. As stipulated in Part 2 of the AID Evaluation Summary, the Mission or Office sponsoring the evaluation must explain why a recommendation is unacceptable. This option is available because an evaluation team might recommend an action that is impractical or inconsistent with other Mission and host country concerns. Any number of reasons might account for this, not the least of which is poor performance by the evaluation team. AID, therefore, has the right to reject recommendations that are based on faulty reasoning, inadequate evidence, or poor judgment. But even when this occurs, the evaluation has accomplished an important objective: it has forced managers to give extra thought to issues that might otherwise have been overlooked or ignored.

To ensure that recommendations are responded to, Part 1 of the AID Evaluation Summary form requires listing the actions to be taken, who is responsible for the action, and the date by which they are to be completed. Other courses of action in response to recommendations must be explained in Part 2. Missions and Offices must establish systems for following up on evaluation recommendations to ensure that actions are taken.

4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN AID’S EVALUATION SYSTEM

SECTION SUMMARY: Responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation are divided between AID/Washington Bureaus and their respective Missions or Offices. This division of responsibilities corresponds to the decentralized management system of the Agency. Missions and Offices are primarily responsible for the planning and implementation of monitoring and evaluation activities. AID/Washington Bureaus are responsible for coordinating evaluation work among their Missions or Offices; conducting evaluations to meet Bureau information needs; providing guidance, standards, and assistance; and integrating Bureau information needs into Mission or Office evaluation work. This section describes the responsibilities of AID officers for monitoring and evaluation activities.

4.1 USAID Missions

AGENCY REQUIREMENTS: 1. USAID Missions are to establish and maintain a monitoring and evaluation system that complies with Agency standards and requirements for using information in the planning and implementation of development programs and projects.

2. The Mission Director has responsibility for organizing and supervising the operation of the Mission’s monitoring and

evaluation system and for ensuring that sufficient funds and staff time are made available so that this system provides adequate information on a timely basis to guide project and program management decisions.

3. A Mission Order describing the organization and assignment of responsibilities for the Mission's monitoring and evaluation system is required.

4. The Mission must incorporate both project- and program-level information needs in an Annual Evaluation Plan. The Annual Evaluation Plan covers a 2-year period (i.e., a 2-year rolling plan, updated annually) and is incorporated in the Action Plan or Annual Budget Submission. Funding for project Information Plans, including estimated evaluations, should be included in project budgets, and funding for special studies should be specified in the Annual Budget Submission.

5. The Mission's monitoring and evaluation system must include Mission review of evaluation findings and follow-up on actions to be taken in response to evaluation recommendations.

6. The Mission's monitoring and evaluation system should ensure that new projects incorporate (1) Information Plans specifying the collection of empirical data related to project objectives and (2) the application of relevant experience in their design.

7. To the extent possible, the Mission will encourage the participation of host country counterparts in evaluations of AID-funded activities.

4.1.1 Mission Director

The Mission Director has ultimate responsibility for sound monitoring and evaluation of projects, assessment of the Mission's program, and compliance with Agency monitoring and evaluation requirements. This role is part of the Mission Director's accountability for proper management of U.S. development assistance. In this regard, Mission Directors are instrumental i setting the standards and practices within Missions for using monitoring and evaluation as a management tool. They should participate as fully as their schedules permit in the planning and review of evaluations, particularly as these activities relate to the issues and questions to be addressed and the follow-up actions to be taken. Typically, the Mission Director delegates responsibility for managing the Mission's monitoring and evaluation system to the Mission Evaluation Officer.

4.1.2 Mission Evaluation Officer

General Responsibilities. The Mission Evaluation Officer works with other Mission staff in carrying out the following responsibilities:

- Developing the Mission's evaluation system (if necessary), formalizing the system in a Mission Order, and implementing the procedures of that system

- Promoting the use of previous AID experience, available in PPC/CDIE and other AID/Washington Offices, for the planning, review, and approval of new projects and programs

- Preparing the Mission's Annual Evaluation Plan, incorporating project and program information needs into the plan, integrating the Evaluation Plan into the Mission Action Plan or Annual Budget Submission, and ensuring that sufficient funding is included in the Annual Budget Submission for upcoming evaluations and special studies if their costs exceed the funds budgeted in the projects involved

- Tracking the scheduling and implementation of evalua- tions, based on the Annual Evaluation Plan

- Assisting Project Officers to design or revise the Information Plans of projects

- Assisting AID officers with the writing of the scopes of work for project evaluations and with other aspects of the evaluation process as needed (e.g., team member selection, Team Planning Meetings)

- Scheduling Mission reviews of evaluation findings and recommendations

- Ensuring that the AID Evaluation Summary is completed and submitted to the appropriate AID/Washington Offices for all evaluations

- Following up on all actions to be taken in response to evaluation recommendations to ensure that they are implemented

- Maintaining and circulating within the Mission evalua- tion findings and lessons learned

- Serving as the liaison between the Mission and AID/ Washington Evaluation Offices and between the Mission and host country evaluation offices and encouraging their participation in AID evaluations

The Annual Evaluation Plan. A major responsibility of the Evaluation Officer is to prepare the Mission's Annual Evaluation Plan. The purpose of the Annual Evaluation Plan is to ensure that the information needed by managers is available for project and program decision-making. A large part of the Annual Evaluation Plan concerns the scheduling of specific project evaluations. But it is equally important that the information needed for program and sector strategy planning be considered when developing the Annual Evaluation Plan. Working with other Mission staff, the Evaluation Officer should identify the types of data and analysis required and determine whether these should be obtained through project, multiproject, or other evaluation studies.

To the extent possible, project evaluations should be used to meet program- or sector-level information requirements. However, it is unlikely that Project Officers will include program or sectoral information needs in project-supported data collection activities without guidance on what these higher level requirements are. In this regard, the Evaluation Officer playc key role in bridging the gap between program information needs and project-supported data collection and analysis. The Evaluation Officer is responsible for providing the necessary coordination. The Annual Evaluation Plan should clarify which program- or sector-level infonmation needs will be met through project evaluations.

Certain program- and sector-level information needs cannot be addressed through individual project evaluations and will require the conduct of special studies or assessments. These studies should also be specified in the Annual Evaluation Plan.

In addition to providing a coherent plan for the Mission, the Annual Evaluation Plan serves as a basis for discussions with AID/Washington during the review of the Mission Action Plan. Similar to the need to coordinate program and project information needs within the Mission, information needs of senior AID/Washington managers have to be incorporated into the Mission's evaluation work to the extent possible. The Annual Evaluation Plan provides an important mechanism for this.

The Annual Evaluation Plan consists of (1) a rolling 2-year schedule listing upcoming evaluations and (2) a brief description of the main issues and reasons for the evaluations planned (e.g., what upcoming decisions will be informed by the evaluation). A discussion of how evaluation results are being used is integrated into the Action Plan narrative. (Detailed instructions and the format for preparing an Annual Evaluation Plan are contained in Appendix C.)

4.1.3 Project Officer

The evaluation responsibilities of the Project Officer are described in Section 3, AID's Evaluation Procedures. In general, the Project Officer's role is one of managing the evaluation procedures rather than actually participating in evaluation (the exceptions being ongoing evaluation utilizing the project's information system and internal, process evaluations). It should be recognized that many Project Officers lack some of the technical skills needed for designing a project information system or for planning interim and final evaluations. The Mission Evaluation Officer should be able to provide assistance or suggest the type of expertise needed, such as an information or evaluation specialist. The monitoring and evaluation responsibilities of the Project Officer may require outside assistance, and AID encourages the use of such specialists when needed. The important point is that the Project Officer ensures that project information systems and evaluations are designed and implemented to provide information useful for management purposes.

The Project Officer completes the AID Evaluation Summary form for project evaluations. When a final evaluation is not conducted, the Project Officer writes the Project Assistance Completion Report.

4.2 Regional and Central Bureaus

AGENCY REQUIREMENTS: 1. AID/Washington Bureaus are to establish and maintain a monitoring and evaluation system that complies with Agency standards and requirements for using infonmation in the planning and programming of AID assistance and in the formulation of related policies.

2. The Assistant Administrator of each regional and central Bureau is responsible for organizing and supervising the operation of the Bureau’s monitoring and evaluation system and for ensuring that sufficient funds and staff time are made available so that this system provides adequate information on a timely basis to guide policy, program, and project management decisions.

3. The internal organization of Bureau evaluation operations will be determined by each Bureau.

4. Regional Bureaus must establish a system to (1) review and approve the Annual Evaluation Plans of their Missions; (2) incorporate Bureau information needs into these plans to the extent possible; (3) assess the soundness of Mission Evaluation Plans and suggest improvements as necessary; (4) prepare an annual Bureau Evaluation Plan covering Bureau information needs and including Bureau-approved Mission evaluation schedules for the corresponding 2-year period; (5) establish reporting and review procedures for field-initiated evaluations; (6) provide guidance, standards, and assistance to Missions and AID/Washington Offices for monitoring and evaluation activities.

5. Central Bureaus must establish a similar system to (1) ensure monitoring and evaluation of centrally funded projects and programs; (2) incorporate Bureau management information needs into planning evaluations sponsored by their Offices and approve Office plans, (3) prepare an annual Bureau Evaluation Plan covering Bureau information needs and including Office evaluation schedules for the corresponding 2-year period; (4) establish evaluation reporting and review procedures, including report distribution to directly involved Missions; and (5) provide guidance, standards, and support to Bureau Offices for monitoring and evaluation activities.

6. The Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination must establish a system to (1) make available docu- ments, reports, evaluations, and other pertinent data to the Agency concerning past and ongoing development programs and projects; (2) disseminate to the Agency information on experience and lessons learned from previous development activities for practical application in new projects and programs; (3) conduct special evaluative studies as requested by AID/ Washington senior managers; (4) conduct evaluative studies that compare and summarize the experience and lessons learned for specific categories of development programs and projects useful for the design of similar development activities; and (5) provide guidance, standards, and technical assistance for monitoring and evaluation activities for the Agency.

4.2.1 Bureau Evaluation Officer

Regional and central Bureaus are responsible for managing the monitoring and evaluation of centrally funded projects and programs supported by the Bureau. Regional Bureaus have additional responsibility for coordinating Bureau information needs with the monitoring and evaluation plans of their Missions, and for backstopping the Missions' monitoring and evaluation activities. These tasks are the responsibility of the Bureau Evaluation Officer, whose administrative and support functions are analogous to those of the Mission Evaluation Officer.

In general, the Bureau Evaluation Officer maintains the overall schedule and plan for the Bureau's evaluation activities. Much like the Mission Evaluation Officer who coordinates programand project-level information requirements within the Mission, the Bureau Evaluation Officer coordinates Bureau information needs with Mission and Office Evaluation Plans. In some cases, this requires including specific categories of information in upcoming evaluations planned by several different Missions or Offices. When Bureau requirements cannot be met through Mission or Office evaluation activities, the Bureau Evaluation Officer is responsible for recommending and, in some cases, managing special studies or assessments. These matters are resolved during the annual evaluation planning process.

Although specific responsibilities vary according to Bureau operations and information requirements, the Bureau Evaluation Officer performs the following tasks:

- Establishes Bureau evaluation policies and procedures consistent with Agency requirements and covering staff roles and responsibilities

- Identifies evaluation-related issues (e.g., use of experience) for AID/Washington review and approval of key programming documents (e.g., CDSS, Central Program Strategy Statement [CPSS], Action Plans, Project Identification Documents, Project Papers, Program Assistance Approval Documents [PAADs])

- Provides guidance on monitoring and evaluation to the Missions or Bureau Offices

- Reviews Mission or Office Annual Evaluation Plans and recommends modifications or additions of evaluative studies if needed

- Prepares the Bureau's Annual Evaluation Plan. This plan describes how Bureau-level management issues and concerns will be addressed through the evaluations planned by Missions and Offices and through other evaluation studies and assessments to be carried out directly by the Bureau as needed. It may also describe other actions planned by the Bureau to support evaluation as a management tool. The Bureau plan incorporates Mission and Office evaluation schedules and is submitted to PPC early in the pertinent fiscal year.

- Works with Bureau project and program Offices and Missions to incorporate evaluation findings and information systems in the design of new development activities

- Synthesizes and disseminates evaluation findings to the Bureau and Missions

- Monitors Mission and Bureau evaluation performance, tracks scheduling and completion of evaluations, and ensures proper submission of the evaluation report and AID Evaluation Summary (in central Bureaus, the AID officer sponsoring the evaluation is responsible for completing the AID Evaluation Summary)

- Provides guidance and assistance on monitoring and evaluation issues and assists the Bureau and Missions to obtain specialists and evaluators

- Reviews selected evaluation scopes of work and reports on soundness and compliance with Bureau and Agency standards

- Sponsors workshops and training for AID staff and counterparts concerning the use of monitoring and evaluation by project and program managers

4.2.2 Center for Development Information and Evaluation

Although the decentralized organization of AID's evaluation system corresponds to the management structure and information needs of the Agency, several evaluation-related activities require a central evaluation office. Studies of sectoral or cross-cutting development issues, the summarization and dissemination of experience and lessons learned in these areas, and broadly applicable monitoring and evaluation guidance have utility for the entire Agency. To address these matters, AID established the Center for Development Information and Evaluation in the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination (PPC/ CDIE). CDIE works with other Bureau and Mission Evaluation Officers and supports evaluative studies designed to provide practical information to AID and other development managers. CDIE's specific responsibilities include the following:

- Synthesizing and disseminating AID's development experience and lessons learned to the Agency, host countries, and the development community

- Making available documents, reports, evaluations, and other pertinent data on previous AID projects and programs

- Providing the statistical data needed by the Agency and for reports to Congress about AID program activities

- Conducting special studies requested by senior AID managers, especially the Administrator

- Conducting special evaluation studies on the effectiveness and impact of AID programs and projects to provide useful information for the planning of similar development activities

- Ensuring that guidance is issued to Missions and Bureaus for the preparation and submission of Annual Evaluation Plans, and recommending consideration of specific cross-cutting issues during evaluation

- Providing guidance, standards, and technical advice for the Agency's monitoring and evaluation system, drawing from current evaluation methods and techniques those that are most applicable and effective in meeting AID's various information requirements

- Reviewing evaluation reports, other pertinent programming documents, and evaluation planning and reporting practices and making recommendations as necessary to promote AID's use of evaluation as a management tool

- Collaborating with Bureau and Mission Evaluation Officers to assist them to perform their responsibilities as effectively as possible

APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country:

2. Project Title:

3. Project Number:

4. Project Dates:

   a. First Project Agreement:
   b. Final Obligation Date: FY-- (planned/actual?)
   c. Most recent Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD):

5. Project Funding: (amounts obligated to date in dollars or dollar equivalents from the following sources)

a.	AID Bilateral Funding (grant and/or loan)	US$
b.	Other Major Donors	US$
c.	Host Country Counterpart Funds	US$
	Total	

6. Mode of Implementation: (host country or AID direct contractor? Include name of contractor.)

7. Project Designers: (organizational names of those involved in the design of the project, e.g., the Government of Sri Lanka, USAID/Colombo, and the International Science and Technology Institute [ISTI]).

8. Responsible Mission Officials: (for the full life of the project)

   a. Mission Director(s):
   b. Project Officer(s):

9. Previous Evaluation(s):

APPENDIX B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OUTLINE

The executive summary is a two- to three-page, single-space document containing a clear, concise summary of the most critical elements of the report. It should be a self-contained document that can stand alone from the report. The summary should be written in such a way that individuals unfamiliar with the project can understand the project’s basic elements and how the findings from the evaluation are related to it without having to refer to any other document.

1. Name of Mission or AID/Washington Office initiating the evaluation, followed by title and date of full evaluation report.

2. Purpose of the activity or activities evaluated. What constraints or opportunities does the activity address; what is it trying to do about the constraints? Specify the problem, then specify the solution and its relationship, if any, to overall Mission or Office strategy. State the purpose and goal from the Logical Framework, if applicable.

3. Purpose of the evaluation and methodology used. Why was the evaluation undertaken and, if a single project or program evaluation, at what stage--interim, final, ex post? Briefly describe the types and sources of evidence used to assess effectiveness and impact.

4. Findings and conclusions. Discuss major findings and conclusions based on the findings as related to the questions in the scope of work. Note any major assumptions about the activity that proved invalid, including policy-related factors. Cite progress since any previous evaluation.

5. Recommendations for this activity and its offspring (in the Mission country or in the Office program). Specify the pertinent conclusions for AID in design and management of the activity, including recommendations for approval/disapproval or for fundamental changes in any follow-on activities. Note any recommendations from a previous evaluation that are still valid but were not acted upon.

6. Lessons learned (for other activities and for AID generally). This is an opportunity to give AID colleagues advice about planning and implementation strategies: how to tackle a similar development problem, key design factors, and factors pertinent to management and to evaluation itself. There may be no clear lessons. Do not stretch the findings by presenting vague generalizations in an effort to suggest broadly applicable lessons. If items 4-5 above are succinctly covered, the reader can derive pertinent lessons. Conversely, do not hold back clear lessons even when they seem trite or naive. Address particularly the following issues:

- Project design implications. Findings/conclusions about this activity that bear on the design or management of other similar activities and their assumptions.

- Broad action implications. Elements that suggest action beyond the activity evaluated and that need to be considered in designing similar activities in other contexts (e.g., policy requirements, procedural matters, factors in the country that were particularly constraining or supportive).

APPENDIX C

PREPARING AN ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN

1. STEPS IN PREPARING THE PLAN

Step 1: Develop a Forward "Decision Schedule"

- Broad programming decision (e.g., upcoming CDSS revision, key decision points in borrower/grantee development planning)
- Portfolio decisions (e.g., upcoming extensions, terminations, follow-ons, and phases)
- Relationship to most recent Action Plan decision/action needs

Step 2: Define Key Questions Related to Decision Schedule

- "Strategic" issues
- Questions relating to achievement of Action Plan benchmarks
- Project/program-specific questions (review Project Paper information plans, additional questions posed by Project Officers)

Step 3: Assign Priority to Questions

- Identify overlapping and residual questions
- Cluster related questions
- Ensure priority to Action Plan benchmark measurements

Step 4: Develop Evaluation Strategy To Get Timely Answers

- Comprehensive program assessment?
- Sector or multiproject evaluations?
- Single project/program evaluations?
- A mixed evaluation strategy?
- Validate/modify existing project information plans

- Alert AID/Washington to anticipated needs for information on broader experience/lessons learned

Step 5: <u>Establish Two-Year Evaluation Schedule</u>

- Assess feasibility (e.g., resources--AID, host country, contracted)
- Formalize borrower/grantee participation
- Include special requirements for data collection/analysis, evaluation and/or management information specialists to assist detailed evaluation design

Step 6: <u>Assign Responsibility for Action</u>

- Project Officers/Project Development Officers
- Program Officer
- Evaluation 0fficer
- Mission or Bureau Office Director

Step 7: <u>Tell Managers When They Can Expect Answers</u>

2. ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN SCHEDULES

Instructions for completing the Annual Evaluation Plan Schedules are as follows (refer to Table C-1):

1. <u>Mission or Central Bureau Evaluation Officer</u>. At the bottom of the first column of the table, indicate the name of the Evaluation officer and the estimated proportion of that individual’s annual time (e.g., 10 percent, 25 percent) devoted to evaluation work.

2. <u>Evaluation List</u> (Column 1). List all evaluations planned for FY 19-- and 19-- by appropriation category or sector. For evaluations of single projects, enter project number and title. For multiproject evaluations, list the identifying numbers and titles of the projects involved. For other evaluations (e.g., PL 480, sector or country evaluations, Housing Guarantee), enter title of the evaluation. For Missions (a separate category), identify evaluations of centrally funded activities (i.e., nonbilateral funds) being implemented in your country that require collateral Mission or Bureau support.

3. <u>Last Evaluation</u> (Column 2). Enter date (month/year) of the most recent previous (if any) evaluation completed for the listed projects/activities. This information should be provided for

projects included in a planned multiproject evaluation or planned single-project evaluation.

4. Evaluation Dates for FY 13-- and 19-- (Column 3). Enter the fiscal year quarter when the evaluation is planned to start and the fiscal year quarter when the completed evaluation report and summary will be sent to the Bureau and PPC/CDIE/DI/Acquisitions. If the current estimate for FY 19-- is different from the previous year’s Evaluation Plan, indicate the change with an asterisk.

5. Reason/Issues (Column 4). For project evaluations, enter (1) current project assistance completion date (PACD); (2) a brief statement on why the evaluation is being planned (e.g., upcoming decisions or events for which the evaluation information will be needed); and (3) key questions and issues on which the evaluation will focus (e.g., whether you expect the host country will be able to maintain project services after AID funding terminates).

6. Funding (Column 5). Estimate the funding required (in thousands of dollars) for each planned evaluation listed and then enter the expected source(s) of funds for each evaluation, if any (e.g., project budget, Program Development and Support [PD&S], central project, Mission Operating Expenses [OE]; Bureau OE). Indicate estimated Mission or Office person-days involved in planning, undertaking, and reviewing the evaluation. If only person-days are indicated, it will be assumed that the evaluation is an entirely "in-house" effort.

7. Collateral Assistance Needed (Column 6). Identify the types of assistance the Mission or Office anticipates it will need to prepare for and carry out each of the evaluations planned. This information should include temporary duty assistance, contractors, or other Mission/Office support. Indicate the number of person-days for each form of assistance. The total number of person-days should correspond to the amount and category of funds requested.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CDIE PUBLICATIONS

AID Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Reports (Available from PPC/CDIE)

Development Associates, Inc. Evaluation Guidelines for Nonproject Assistance: Commodity Import Programs (CIPs) and CIP-Like Activities. Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: AID, August 1985.

Evaluation Studies Branch, International Statistical Programs Center, U.S. Bureau of the Census; and Center for Development Information and Evaluation, U.S. Agency for International Development. Selecting Data Collection Methods and Preparing Contractor Scopes of Work. Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: AID, August 1985.

Goldmark, Susan, and Ray Rosengard. A Manual for Evaluating Small-Scale Enterprise Development Projects. Report No. 6. Washington, D.C.: AID, November 1985.

Kumar, Krishna. Conducting Group Interviews in Developing Countries. Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: AID, April 1987.

Kumar, Krishna. Rapid, Low-Cost Data Collection Methods for AID, Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: AID, December 1987.

Norton, Maureen, and Sharon Pines Benoliel. Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plans for AID-Assisted Projects. Report No. 9. Washington, D.C.: AID, 1987.

Practical Concepts, Inc. Manager’s Guide to Data Collection. Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: AID, November 1979.

White, Louise G. An Approach to Evaluating the Impact of AID Projects. Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: AID, March 1986.

AID Evaluation Occasional Papers

Hermann, Chris. Evaluating the Socio-Economic Impact of Rural Road Projects: Three Approaches to Baseline and Follow-Up Data Collection Designs. Paper No. 9. Washington, D.C.: AID, April 1986.

Hermann, Chris. Information Planning for Policy Reform Programs. Paper No. 13. Washington, D.C.: AID, August 1986.

Hermann. Chris. Designing Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: Issues and Opportunities. Paper No. 14. Washington, D.C.: AID, October 1987.

OTHER AID REPORTS
(available from the sponsoring AID bureau)

Bureau for Asia and Near East, Office of Development Planning, Evaluation Division. Asia Near East Bureau Procedural Guidelines for Evaluation. February 1986.

Gormley, Wilma, and Fred Rosensweig. Facilitator Guide for Conducting a Team Planning Meeting. WASH Technical Report No. 32. Washington, D.C.: Water and Sanitation for Health Project, Office of Health, Bureau for Science and Technology, Agency for International Development, November 1985.

Management Systems International. Proposed Evaluation System for the Revolving Fund and Related Activities of AID'S Bureau for Private Enterprise, Final Report. Washington, D.C.: MSI, September

OTHER REFERENCES

American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service. Evaluation Source Book for Private and Voluntary Organizations. Edited by Daniel Santo Pietro. New York: ACVAFS, 1983.

Casley, Dennis J., and Krishna Kumar. Project Monitoring and Evaluation in Agriculture. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press for the World Bank, 1987.

Casley, Dennis J., and Krishna Kumar. The Collection, Analysisand Use of Monitoring and Evaluation Data. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press for the World Bank, 1988.

Hannah, John P., with George Honadle, Tjip Walker, and Albert H. Barclay, Jr. Sustaining Rural Development: A Guide for Project Planners, Managers, Evaluators, and Trainers. Washington, D.C.- Development Alternatives, Inc., May 1984.

Miles. Matthew B.. and A. Michael Huberman. Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1984.

Murphy, Josette, and Leendert H. Sprey. Introduction to Farm Surveys. Wageningen, The Netherlands: International Institute for Land Reclamation and Improvement (ILRI), 1983.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Methods and Procedures in Aid Evaluation: A Compendium of Donor Practice and Experience. Paris, France: OECD, 1986.

Patton, Michael Quinn. Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1980.

Patton, Michael Quinn. Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Second Edition. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1986.

Rossi, Peter H., and Howard E. Freeman. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. Third edition. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1985.

Rutman, Leonard. Planning Useful Evaluations: Evaluability Assessment. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1980.

Trochim, William M. K., ed. Advances in Quasi-Experimental Design and Analysis. San Francisco and London: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1986.

U.S. General Accounting Office. Report to the Administrator, Agency for International Development: Experience--A Potential Tool for Improving U.S. Assistance Abroad. (GAO/ID-82-36). Washington, D.C.: GAO, June 15, 1982.

Yin, Robert K. Case Study Research Design and Methods. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Volume 5. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.